

Agricultural Colonies

Q.—500. Sri K. PRABHAKAR
(Nelemangala—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) when the Committee for making proposals to Government regarding the formation of Agricultural Colonies in the State was formed under the Presidentship of the Revenue Commissioner;

(b) how many times it has met;

(c) the proposals it has sent up to Government so far in the matter?

A.—Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA
(Minister for Agriculture).—

(a) In January 1955.

(b) Twice.

(c) The Committee have recommended to Government to sanction staff needed for the implementation of the scheme and this is under consideration.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

Disturbance in Chitaldrug and Tumkur Towns during Sri Dhebar's visit.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy has given notice of an adjournment motion which runs as follows :

"This House do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, to wit:

The failure of the Government to maintain law and order on 29th October 1955 at Chitaldrug and Tumkur towns during the Congress President Sri U. N. Dhebar's visit to the said places resulting in the protagonists including some M.L.A.'s. of Mysore retention as a separate political entity, beaten up and manhandled by the goondas."

Do you want anything to say? It is a matter of day-to-day administration.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—(Chitaldrug).—I will point out to the House and the Chair how it is admissible. On the 29th October when the Congress President Sri U. N. Dhebar visited Chitaldrug and Tumkur, many persons who were interested in retaining Mysore as a political entity arising out of the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission wanted to

present a memorandum to the Congress President. They were prevented by some goondas. I do not know whether they were engaged or whether they were provoked. Those goondas prevented these members.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—You need not go to the merits of the case.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am telling how it is of public importance. They wanted to present a memorandum concerning the vital interests of Mysore and therefore it is a matter of public importance.

These incidents took place on the 29th October and therefore it is a matter of recent occurrence.

It is a matter of urgency because, such instances are taking place under the very nose of the Police. The Police have miserably failed to maintain law and order. It has been reported that in certain places, they have actually acquiesced in the process of beating up these members being mere onlookers. Therefore Government have miserably failed to maintain law and order and hence this motion is admissible.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home).—Sir, so far as the incident which is alleged to have taken place at Chitaldrug, is concerned Government have no information in the matter.....

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—It was published in the papers, Sir.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is not what is published in the papers that I am saying. I have not received any report from my Officers. I am sure that if an incident of that nature had taken place, Government would have been informed of it.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know whether any Hon'ble Member has brought it to the notice of the Government.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—No, Sir.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—An Hon'ble Member of the Legislative Council has given a statement which has been published in most of the papers including up-country papers. If Government have not cared to look into the same, it is their fault.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If my friend is pleased to lend his ears to me, I am prepared to answer. I would request him not to generate any heat. There is no need.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—When the Hon'ble Minister is denying knowledge of it.....

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I may assure my friend that mere allegations, however forceful, do not have the force of facts. So far as Chitaldrug is concerned, Government have not been informed of any such incident. Now that the matter is brought to my notice, I will make enquires. It is no doubt true that there was a report in the papers I believe it was from the Hon'ble Member of the Legislative Council, Sri Sanjeeva Reddy. That is a matter on which I have no information.

Regarding the incident said to have taken place at Tumkur, no doubt, an incident did take place. The Police have already taken action. I believe the matter is before the Courts. I think it is *sub judice*. It won't be right—it may not be correct—to form it as a subject matter of an adjournment motion.

I may assure the Hon'ble Member that so far as Government are concerned, they are primarily interested, mainly interested and solely interested in the maintenance of law and order. Whether the trouble arises either from those that advocate one State or two States, Government cannot countenance a breach of the law or anything else adversely affecting the maintenance of law and order. I may assure, Sir, that law is no respecter of persons. I may also assure Sir that whenever such an incident happens, no Police Officer will either acquiesce or be a silent spectator. So far as that is concerned, the Hon'ble Member need not entertain any doubt. I may assure him once again that if there are any matters which arise for the consideration of the Government regarding law and order, they will deal with it justly, impartially and firmly.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂಜೀವರದ್ಧಿಯವರ ಲೇಖನವನ್ನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಘಟನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ತಮಗೇನೂ ತಿಳಿಯದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇಂಥಾ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ

ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನುಮಾಡಿದರು ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ನಡೆಯಿತೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಣೆ ತರಿಸಿ, ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But that cannot be answered now. You can send a short notice question and elicit answers.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—It arises out of a statement made by the Home Minister, Sir. The Home Minister said that if it had been brought to the notice of the Government, he would have made enquiries. Here a respectable member of the Legislative Council brought to the notice of the Government through the Press.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with whether Government have made an enquiry or not. I am concerned only with the question of admissibility of the adjournment motion.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Government have failed to maintain law and order and because of the urgency of the matter and of public importance, it should be allowed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is all right.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I will have to make one thing clear. If the Hon'ble Member to whom a reference is made, really wanted to bring it to the notice of Government, he could have written to me, he could have asked me to make an enquiry. I would not have failed in my duty. I would have certainly instituted an enquiry.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—This matter cannot be overlooked Sir. This is a very important matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already stated, and I will have to restate, that if the Government has failed in its duty, I am not responsible for it. Now the question is : whether it is admissible or not. I wanted to know the opinion of the Hon'ble Member. Now I have heard both the parties and I will give my ruling tomorrow.

Sri R. K. PRASAD (Bangalore).—I would request the Hon'ble Speaker to give a ruling today alone. Some people might speak about the Karnataka issue. The Leader of the Opposition may speak on the special points today. The other day also you told us that you would give a ruling tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give my ruling today alone.

Now the next item on the agenda may be taken up.

Papers laid on the Table.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home).—I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification dated 28th October 1955, issued under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939. (Cops placed in Legislature Library. *Vide* No. 33—L.A.)

DISCUSSION ON STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The next item on the agenda is, consideration of the States Re-organisation Commission report. Before taking up the report, I would invite the suggestions of the Hon'ble Members regarding two points. The time available at our disposal as per the schedule of programme is three days, and the time at our disposal would be not more than ten hours. We will sit for five hours every day and deduct half an hour for interval and one hour will be taken away for question time. That means only three hours and a half will be left at our disposal for discussion of the report. At that rate for three days, it comes to 10 hours. It is needless for me to state that every Hon'ble Member should be given an opportunity to express his views on this important matter. In view of this, I would like to know whether it is desirable to limit the time for each speaker or whether it is advisable to sit longer hours each day than the usual time of sitting.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—May I suggest one thing Sir? It is indeed very good of you to have raised this question at the earliest possible stage. Sir, I remember the Seshadri Committee Report was given more time for discussion. After all that was only an interim report which was mainly placed before this House, whereas the present report is of greater significance: the questions involved are of supreme

importance. Therefore it is much better to allot more time in consultation with the Government for discussion of all the implications involved in the report so that the members of this House may participate in the discussion fully.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I quite agree with Sri Mariappa. This is a very important issue which has been engaging the attention of the entire State and it has become a very controversial issue. So, I do not believe that any purpose would be served by imposing restriction upon the members. I think, ten days were allowed for the discussion of the Fact Finding Committee Report. Now it has come to a practical issue to express so many facts and so many points have to be thrashed out. I think the number of days allotted must be increased.

Originally the adjourned session was fixed on the 10th of this month. I do not know why it was again adjourned to this day all at once. Now the three days allotted for discussion, taking into consideration the importance of the subject, are wholly inadequate. I do not know why the Government are chary in allotting so many days for such an important matter. I feel that there should be no time restriction imposed on this matter. It may be left to the parties themselves to adjust among themselves as to who should be the speakers and other things. But in such important matters, there should not be any restriction. I feel the Government should increase the number of days.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose we do not limit the time; even at that rate, it may not be possible to finish discussion on the report.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We can over-work by one or two hours every day. As it is, Sunday also has been included. Some of us feel that we must be free on Sunday. Let the session be continued to go on in its own usual course. Let us have a holiday. If need be, let us sit for 15 minutes or half an hour extra every day, but there should not be any extra work. The Report has to be discussed threadbare. In fairness to all persons, it is necessary to allot more number of days.